

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the Office Action of February 17, 2009. Claims 1–40 are pending. Upon entry of this response, Claims 1 and 34 will be amended and claims 17–33 will be withdrawn.

I Restriction Requirement

The Office Action required restriction to one of the following: Group I (Claims 1–16 and 34–40), Group II (Claims 17–25), Group III (Claims 26–31) or Group IV (Claims 32–33). Applicants elect Group I (Claims 1–16 and 34–40) without traverse.

The Office Action also required election of one of the following species if Group I was elected: Species A (Claims 2–12, directed to non-computer readable medium asset management method) or Species B (Claims 13–16, directed to computer readable medium asset management method). Applicants elect Species B without traverse. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that as amended, Claims 1–16 and 34–40 are within the elected species.

The Office Action required further elections if Species A or Group II were elected. It is respectfully submitted these further requirements are moot as neither Species A nor Group II were elected.

It is respectfully submitted the Claims 1–16 and 34–40 are patentably distinguished from the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

II M.P.E.P. §707.07(j)

M.P.E.P. §707.07(j) states:

“...If the examiner is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, the examiner may note in the Office action that certain aspects or features of the patentable invention have not

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/798,007
Attorney Docket Number: 307217.01
Filing Date: March 10, 2004

been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims may be given favorable consideration...”

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make Applicants aware of any subject matter disclosed by the present application which the Examiner believes is patentable. By doing so, the Examiner would help expedite prosecution by enabling Applicants to amend the present claims or draft new claims directed to such subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the art of record and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/798,007
Attorney Docket Number: 307217.01
Filing Date: March 10, 2004

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 17, 2009

By: /MacLane C. Key/

MacLane C. Key, Reg. No.: 48,250
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (703) 647-6566
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 17, 2009
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/798,007
Attorney Docket Number: 307217.01
Filing Date: March 10, 2004